

CCRB INVESTIGATIVE RECOMMENDATION

Investigator: Benjamin Shelton	Team: Squad #11	CCRB Case #: 201904674	<input type="checkbox"/> Force	<input type="checkbox"/> Discourt.	<input type="checkbox"/> U.S.
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Abuse	<input type="checkbox"/> O.L.	<input type="checkbox"/> Injury
Incident Date(s) Wednesday, 08/08/2018 2:16 PM	Location of Incident: in the vicinity of § 87(2)(b)	Precinct: 88	18 Mo. SOL 2/8/2020	EO SOL 2/8/2020	
Date/Time CV Reported Thu, 05/30/2019 3:42 PM	CV Reported At: CCRB	How CV Reported: Phone	Date/Time Received at CCRB Thu, 05/30/2019 3:42 PM		

Complainant/Victim	Type	Home Address

Subject Officer(s)	Shield	TaxID	Command
1. POM Ali Walker	02673	929329	088 PCT

Witness Officer(s)	Shield No	Tax No	Cmd Name
1. POM Bruce Pollock	08027	961111	088 PCT

Officer(s)	Allegation	Investigator Recommendation
A.POM Ali Walker	Abuse: Police Officer Ali Walker made sexually suggestive remarks to § 87(2)(b)	

Case Summary

On May 30, 2019, § 87(2)(b) filed this complaint over the phone with the CCRB.

On August 8, 2018, at approximately 2:16 p.m., § 87(2)(b) called 911 to report that an individual was following and harassing her and PO Ali Walker and PO Bruce Pollock of the 88th Precinct responded to her location at § 87(2)(b) in Brooklyn. § 87(2)(b) explained to the officers why she called 911. PO Walker stated to § 87(2)(b) “I can’t believe he’s harassing you,” “I don’t know what he sees in you,” and expressed disbelief that anyone would be interested in someone who looks like § 87(2)(b) (**Allegation A: Abuse of Authority**, § 87(2)(g)). After advising § 87(2)(b) that she should move from the area if she was so upset by the individual’s presence, PO Walker and PO Pollock left the location.

No summonses were issued and no arrests were made regarding this incident.

No video footage capturing this incident was obtained.

Findings and Recommendations

Allegation A – Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Ali Walker made sexually suggestive remarks to § 87(2)(b)

§ 87(2)(b) a black female with short hair, met with PO Walker and PO Pollock outside of § 87(2)(b) and explained to them that a male individual had been harassing and stalking her for months by waiting outside her house, trying to gain access to her apartment, tampering with her mailbox, and leaving her unsolicited handwritten messages (BR 01-02). As she spoke to the officers, PO Walker continuously looked § 87(2)(b) up and down and made several statements to her including, “I can’t believe he’s harassing you,” “I don’t know what he sees in you,” and expressing disbelief that someone would be interested in “someone who looks like you § 87(2)(b)”. § 87(2)(b) asked PO Walker why he thought being stalked was a compliment. She also asked PO Walker what he meant by his comments. PO Walker repeated that he found it difficult to believe that the alleged perpetrator would be interested in someone who looked like § 87(2)(b). § 87(2)(b) asked PO Walker if he made those comments because she was a black woman and told him that she had the same skin and hair as him. PO Walker did not respond.

PO Walker had no independent recollection of the incident (BR 03). He confirmed that he must have been at § 87(2)(b) at the alleged time of the incident for a report of a past crime, but this was based on his memo book entries (BR 04). He could not provide any additional or specific information about why he responded or what the nature of the past crime was. When presented a redacted photograph of § 87(2)(b)’s photo identification, PO Walker did not recognize her and still had no recollection of the incident. When provided a narrative of the alleged incident, PO Walker recalled an incident that he believed might have been related to this incident. On a day and time near the alleged incident date and time, PO Walker responded to a nearby location outside on South Portland Avenue, near § 87(2)(b) to speak to a black female, who he could not confirm was § 87(2)(b) who had complained that her mail was not securely delivered and/or kept in her mailbox. She also complained that her door was not secure. However, PO Walker did not recall this incident being related to any stalker or specific perpetrator. PO Walker stated that this was the first time he interacted with that black female and did not recall interacting with her since. When presented the Event printout (BR 05) related to the incident, PO Walker still had no further specific recollection of the incident but stated that the listed responding unit was himself and PO Pollock.

PO Pollock recalled meeting a bald black female at the incident location whose complaint regarded a male worker in her apartment building who was stalking her (BR 06). When presented a redacted photograph of § 87(2)(b)'s photo identification, PO Pollock did not recognize her and could not confirm if she was the same individual at § 87(2)(b). The female yelled and rambled as she explained and both officers were unclear as to the exact issue that the female was experiencing. Both officers asked general questions, such as who exactly the perpetrator was, why she thought he was stalking her, and what he did and when and where he did it. PO Pollock did not recall one officer communicating with the complainant more than the other. PO Pollock described the complainant's answers as generally incoherent because officers had to ask her the same questions multiple times and had to ask many follow-up questions for answers that did not make sense. PO Pollock did not recall any specific examples her incoherence. When the officers asked what led to the stalking and her relationship with the alleged perpetrator, the female yelled at them that people do not find her or other bald black women attractive. PO Pollock explained that this comment seemed unprovoked by anything either officer said and he did not know why she began talking about her appearance and why people may or may not find her attractive. PO Pollock stated that PO Walker never expressed any disbelief about what the female told the officers. PO Pollock stated that PO Walker never commented on the female's physical appearance.

The Event, ICAD #§ 87(2)(b) for this incident confirmed that unit 88D responded to § 87(2)(b) at 2:16 pm. on the incident date after an individual who identified herself as a black female with short hair called to report a man who was following her. Both officers testified that they were assigned to sector D in the 88th Precinct at the time of the incident.

§ 87(2)(g)

Civilian and Officer CCRB Histories

- This is the first CCRB complain to which § 87(2)(b) has been party § 87(2)(b) (BR 07).
- PO Walker has been a member of service for 18 years and has been subject of four other allegations in three cases with no substantiations (see officer history)

Mediation, Civil and Criminal Histories

- § 87(2)(b) declined to mediate this complaint.
- On July 26, 2019, the Office of the New York City Comptroller indicated that no Notices of Claim were filed regarding this incident (BR 09).
- [§ 87(2)(b)] [§§ 86(1)(3)&(4)] [§ 87(2)(c)]

Squad No.: 11

Investigator:	_____	Inv. Benjamin Shelton	_____
	Signature	Print Title & Name	Date

Squad Leader:	_____	IM Edwin Peña	_____
	Signature	Print Title & Name	Date

Reviewer:	_____	_____	_____
	Signature	Print Title & Name	Date